MYSORE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Saturday, 16th October 1965.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Vidhana Soudha, Bangalore, at Thirty Minutes past Eight of the Clock.

MR. SPEAKER (SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA, B.A., B.L.) in the Chair.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA (Deputy Minister for Minor Irrigagation).—Sir, on behalf of the Minister for Revenue, I beg to lay a copy of the Notification No. R. D. 82 LRY 65, dated 29th September 1965 (The Mysore Land Reforms Rules, 1955) as required under Section 140 of the Mysore Land Reforms Act, 1961.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The notification is laid on the Table.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Minister for Home).—Sir, on behalf of the Minister for Transport, I beg to lay a copy of the Annual Report of the Mysore State Road Transport Corporation for the year 1961-62 as required under Section 35(3) of the Road Transport Corporation Act, 1950 (Central Act 64 of 1950).

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Annual Report of the Mysore State Road Transport Corporation for the year 1961-62 is laid on the Table.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.

Re: the Power Line Mishap at Peenya.

- Sri S. M. KRISHNA (Maddur).—Sir, I beg to call the attention of the Hon'ble Chief Minister to the power line mishap at Peenya on 13th October 1965.
- Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Chief Minister).—The Civil Engineering works connected with the outdoor yard station at Peenya for the second stage have been entrusted to Sri S. Panthaki, registered PWD Graduate Contractor, Class II. This contractor started the works about 3 months back and the same has been in progress as per schedule. Four 'A' frames required for extending the bus bars had been completed and arrangements were made to concrete the connecting beam for one set of two 'A' frames which are 45 feet apart. This R. C. C. beam is at a height of 30 feet above ground level.

(SRI S. NIJALINGAPPA)

The concreting of this connecting beam was started on the afternoon of the 13th October 1965. During the course of laying concrete, the shuttering work suddenly gave way and the entire R.C.C. beam, together with the two 'A' frames came down.

The consequences of this accident are detailed below:

- (1) Two Contractor's labourers were caught in the debris and died. Due to the large quantity of reinforcement, concrete and heavy weight of the shuttering materials, it was very difficult to take out the bodies from the debris. After strenuous efforts by the Department using heavy lift cranes, trucks, etc., it has been possible to extricate these two bodies only on the morning of the 15th October 1965.
- (2) Twenty-seven other labourers belonging to the contractor who were working in the area got injured. The injured were rushed immediately to the several hospitals in the City for treatment. Of the injured, 8 were given First Aid and immediately discharged. The remaining 19 labourers with minor injuries are undergoing treatment and still in the Hospital; their condition is satisfactory. The list of these labourers is indicated below. One of these labourers was caught up in the reinforcement rods and it was possible to extricate him with great difficulty after using cranes, etc., and was rushed to the Hospital.
- (3) Two Junior Engineers, who were supervising the work, also got slight injuries and were immediately rushed to Hospital. One of them has been discharged and the other is still in the Hospital undergoing treatment for minor injuries.

It may be observed from the above that, except for the two Junior Engineers, all the injured people, including the dead, belonged to the Contractor. According to the terms of agreement, the Contractor is responsible for the payment of compensation to the injured and the dependents of the deceased as per Workmen's Compensation Act. The cost of the work damaged is about Rs. 20,000 and this work has to be re-done by the Contractor at his own cost as per terms of the contract.

The Police are investigating into the causes of the accident.

List showing names of Injured persons obtained from the Hospital

Sl. No.	Name	Father's name	Age	$\operatorname{Address}$
K. C. Hospital, Malleswaram				
Sarvashri:—				
1	Muniyappa	Shamanna	30	Peenya, Bangalore
2	Gopalappa	Gopaiah	40	Swathantrapalya, Dasaralli
3	Rangappa	Chikkananjiah	30	Peenya, Bangalore
4	Syed Hussain	Syed Mohiyuddin	20	do
5	Beere Gowda	Dodde Gowda	20	do
6	Raju	Vee r appa	16	do
7	Smt. Mangamma	w/o Tippanna	25	do
8	Smt. Kamalamma	Mani	20	do
9	$\mathbf{Maduremuttu}$	Mani	2 5	Sreerampuram, Banga- lore
10	Nanjappa	Nanjundiah	30	Peenya, Bangalore
11	Mallappa	Subbanna	25	do
12	Muniswamappa	Rangappa	30	$d\mathbf{o}$
	Victoria Hospital			*
13	M. V. Narayan	Junior Engineer	3 6	Seshadripuram, Bangalore
14	Pachappa	Kempanna	30	Peenya, Bangalore
15	Abdul Raheem	Md. Mustansab	30	Dasarahalli, Bangalore
16	Muttu		30	Peenya, Bangalore
17	Muniyappa	Muniyellappa	16	Peenya, Bangalore
Bowring Hospital				
18	Rudrappa	Chandrappa	25	Peenya, Bangalore
19	Perumal	Karia	40	Peenya, Bangalore
20	Puttaiah		30	Dasarahalli, Bangalore.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, it is a very serious matter; I am sure you concede that. I am given to understand that the accident took place because of the defective way in which the contractor got the whole beam set—lack of proper proportions, lack of supervision and all that. Now, there is a cell in the P. W. D. which goes into such complaints. I would like to verify from the Chief Minister if that technical cell has been suthorised to go into this question and I would like to know, when the report of that cell is made known, whether it would be made available to this House?

- Mr. SPEAKER.—Normally, I would not allow such questions because if I once allow it becomes a precedent and it becomes like an answer to a Starred Question and supplementaries. Rule 63 specifically says that a statement made by the concerned Minister shall not form the subject matter of any questions at the moment.
- Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Once I had drawn your attention to the practice in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha and you were convinced. Last time, I showed the relevant proceedings to you, Sir.
- Mr. SPEAKER.—Why not the member suggest that the rule be amended?
 - Sri S. M. KRISHNA If need be, it will have to be done.
- Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA (Cheif Minister).—Sir, I have already stated that the matter is under investigation by the police. I do not want to prejudice the investigation by making any statement at this stage. Everything will be done.

MYSORE CONTINGENCY FUND (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1965. Introduction

Sri H. R. ABDUL GAFFAR (Deputy Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg to introduce the Mysore Contingency Fund (Amendment) Bill, 1965.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Bill is introduced. It has also been intimated that the recommendation of the Governor has been received.

MOTION Re: MEASURES TO STEP UP FOOD PRODUCTION AND TO PREVENT ANY SCARCITY IN THE STATE.

(Debate continued.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—There has been a number of requests from the members that they should be given a chance of five minutes each. Yesterday I studied the whole matter. Last night I spent an hour over this. There are 42 members whose names came to me of whom 8 or 9 are from the Opposition and the rest are from the Ruling Party. Repeated and sincere requests from the members have made me feel that I should try to give them a chance. On how best I can do that, I should like to have some guidance from the Chief Minister and members.

Sri S. NIJALINGAPPA.— You have been pleased to say that this is an important matter and that is the feeling of the House also. I do not want to do anything by way of putting any limitations. I leave it entirely to you. If you think it necessary the whole day may be given, I have no objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.— The difficulty comes in this way. One of the oldest and perhaps the seniormost member Sri Hulkoti made a request to me to give him a chance. There are 46 members who want to speak.